

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

Legislative Record

OF THE

Eighty-Third Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1927

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Thursday, February 24, 1927.

The House met according to adjournment and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Rev. Mrs. Knowlton of Augusta.

Journal of the previous session read and approved.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

From the Senate: Bill an act in relation to the bridge built across the Kennebec river between Bath and Woolwich. (S. P. 315)

In the Senate, referred to the committee on Military Affairs.

In the House, on motion by Mr. Gilchrest of Thomaston, tabled pending reference in concurrence.

From the Senate: Bill an act for the protection of life from the peril of fire in public buildings used for the purposes of education, mercy, correction and theatres, (H. P. 380) (H. D. 96) which in the House was referred to the committee on Education, February 15th.

Comes from the Senate, referred to the committee on Legal Affairs in non-concurrence.

In the House, on motion by Mr. Littlefield of Kennebunk, that body voted to recede and concur with the Senate in the reference of this bill to the committee on Legal Affairs.

Senate Bills in First Reading

S. P. 16, S. D. 109: An act to provide for the marking of the Maine and New Hampshire boundary line.

S. P. 33, S. D. 120: An act relating to taking of clams in Cutler.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on Legal Affairs on bill, An Act to amend Section 70 of Chapter 211 of the Public Laws of 1921 relating to reserved automobile registration numbers, S. P. 101 S. D. 37, reporting same in a new draft, S. P. 272, S. D. 96, under same title, and that it "ought to pass."

In the Senate, report read and accepted, and the new draft passed to be engrossed.

In the House, report read and accepted in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Goodwin of Sanford the House voted to reconsider its action whereby the report of the committee was accepted in concurrence; and on further motion by the same gentleman the report was tabled, pending acceptance in concurrence.

From the Senate: the following order:

Ordered, the House concurring, that a committee be appointed consisting of three members on the part of the Senate, with as many as the the House may join, for the purpose of presenting to the Governor and Council a selection of Aroostook potato.

In the Senate, read and passed, with the following members appointed on its part: Senators Mitchell, Bragdon and Mrs. Pinkham.

In the House, the order received passage in concurrence, and the Chair appointed upon that committee, Messrs. Kitchen of Presque Isle, Hammond of Van Buren and Crawford of Houlton.

The following bills and remonstrances were received and upon recommendation of the committee on reference of bills were referred to the following committees:

Indian Affairs

By Mr. Lait of Old Town: An act relating to the Penobscot Tribe of Indians. (H. P. 927)

Inland Fisheries and Game

By Mr. Stone of Bridgton: An act relating to Smelts (H. P. 928) (500 copies ordered printed.)

Judiciary

By Mr. Chamberlain of Ft. Fairfield: Remonstrance of B. C. Ames and 26 others opposing the repeal in any manner of our present primary law. (H. P. 930)

By Mr. Cole of So. Portland: An act regulating the sale and use of certain firearms, silencers and noxious gases and prescribing penalties and rules of evidence with reference thereto. (H. P. 929)

(1000 copies ordered printed.)

State Lands and Forest Preservation

By Mr Lait of Old Town: An act

relating to the establishment of town forests. (H. P. 931)

(500 copies ordered printed.)

Taxation

By Mr. Webber of China: An act to provide an excise tax upon tobacco products and to make the proceeds available for the development of Maine and for general and rural education. (H. P. 932)

(500 copies ordered printed.)

Orders

Mr. Hammond of Van Buren presented the following order:

Ordered, that we may call attention to the emblem of Aroostook, The Irish Potato, symbol of prosperity, of health, happiness and contentment, our most economic food product, responsible for an added \$68,000,000 to our material wealth in 1926, with the natural increase in transportation revenues.

Reposing in all its grace and beauty on the desk before you on this day, decreed by the Legislature and ordained by the Governor, we ask the House to rise, bow before its shrine, study well its qualities, speak eloquently of its virtues, spread its gospel of good will and satisfying comfort to a hungry world, that those of us who already bask in its sunshine may share our glories with you. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that this order receive passage?

Thereupon the order was passed by a unanimous rising vote, amid the applause of the members.

On motion by Mr. Robie of Gorham, it was

Ordered, that the chairs on the floor of the House be reserved for the members of the House and Senate until ten minutes of two this afternoon, February 24th, excepting such seats as need be set aside for the use of committees and proponents and opponents of the bills under consideration.

On motion by Mr. Piper of Jackman, it was

Ordered, that the superintendent of buildings purchase 200 guest chairs and have same placed in the House of Representatives, the same to be charged to legislative expense.

On motion by Mr. Griffin of Biddeford, it was

Ordered, that when the clerk of the House makes up the pay roll thereof

he be instructed to include therein for payment to Mrs. James G. C. Smith, widow of the late Representative James G. C. Smith of Biddeford, the same salary and mileage to which he would have been entitled had he served during the entire term of this Legislature.

On motion by Mr. Douglas of Chelsea, it was.

Ordered, the Senate concurring, that the commissioner of agriculture be, and hereby is, requested to furnish this Legislature with a statement showing the amounts of premiums and gratuities paid by the various agricultural societies of the State at the exhibitions held in 1926, such amounts forming the basis for the distribution of the State stipend for that year.

Reports of Committees

Mr. Weston from the committee on library reported ought not to pass on resolve for the purchase of 100 copies of "Brief Biographical Dictionary of Who's Who in Maine, Vol. 1, 1926-27." (H. P. No. 471)

Mr. White from same committee on resolve authorizing the State librarian to purchase for the State 150 copies of the "History of Oxford County" when printed, (H. P. No. 28) reported that same be referred to next Legislature.

Reports read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Roy from the committee on library reported ought to pass on resolve for the purchase of 250 copies of "Portland by the Sea." (H. P. No. 534)

Mr. Mansfield from same committee reported same on resolve for the purchase of 50 copies of "Two American Pioneers." (H. P. No. 472)

Mr. White from same committee reported same on resolve for the purchase of 75 copies of "Matinicus Isle, Its Story and Its People." (H. P. No. 180)

Reports read and accepted and the resolves ordered printed under the joint rules.

Mr. Ferguson from the committee on pensions on resolve in favor of Lewis F. Ryan, Civil War Veteran, (H. P. No. 139) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 933) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Report read and accepted and the new draft ordered printed under the joint rules.

Report A of the committee on Federal relations reporting ought to pass on

concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to abolish the Federal estate (inheritance) tax. (H. D. No. 11)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. SLOCUM of Cumberland
—of the Senate
GAGNE of Biddeford
VARNUM of Westbrook
CYR of Waterville
NADEAU of Lewiston

—of the House
Report B of same committee reporting ought not to pass on same resolution.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. HARRIMAN of Kennebec
DUNBAR of Hancock
—of the Senate
DENNISON of E. Machias
CHAMBERLAIN of
Ft. Fairfield
SAUCIER of Wallagrass Pl.

—of the House
Mr. HOLMAN of Bangor: Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of Report A favoring the adoption of the resolution, and in order that we may understand just what we are voting upon, I would like to take a very few moments for a discussion of this proposition. It is simply a request to our Senators and Representatives to Congress, requesting them to do everything in their power to have the Federal Estate Inheritance Tax Law repealed.

In discussing this proposition, let us take it up under three headings: First, what is the Federal Estate Tax, second, how does it operate here in our own State, and third, what are the reasons why the law should be repealed?

First, what is the Federal Estate Inheritance Tax Law? It is simply a law that has been enacted by the Congress of the United States imposing inheritance taxes upon the several states of the Union. This power is given Congress under our Federal Constitution to be exercised in times of war or great national stress. It is well believed by the best authorities on constitutional law that it was never intended by the makers of that immortal document that this power should be exercised in times of peace and prosperity. In the history of this country we have only had some four or five Federal Inheritance Tax Laws. The first one was levied in 1798 and was repealed in 1802; the second in 1864, and was repealed in 1870; the third in 1898 and

repealed in 1902. The present Federal Inheritance Tax was imposed on the states in 1916 to raise revenue to meet the great expenses of the World War. Although it has been revised and amended several times since 1916, it has not been repealed for some reason or other.

In 1924 a tax ranging from one per cent to forty per cent was imposed upon all inheritances in excess of fifty thousand dollars. By the law of 1925 this was changed and modified somewhat. In February, 1926, the law was further amended, making a tax rate of from one to twenty per cent on estates in excess of one hundred thousand dollars, giving to the states eighty per cent, and the Federal Government retaining twenty per cent, that is, the states were allowed a credit of eighty per cent providing they would pass an enabling act accepting the proposition that had been submitted to them by the Federal Government; otherwise it would be impossible for them to participate in the eighty per cent, and the Federal Government would receive the entire tax, so that, under this proposition, the only thing for the State of Maine to do and the only thing for the other states of the Union to do is to pass an enabling act accepting this proposition, increasing our inheritance tax rate to such an extent as to absorb the credit that we are allowed under this Federal tax.

Now the question arises, how does it work out so far as our own State is concerned? Let us take an illustration: Supposing a man dies here in the State of Maine, leaving an estate of one million dollars, if my memory serves me correctly, the tax rate on this estate would be eight per cent or eighty thousand dollars. Of this eighty thousand dollars the State of Maine, providing it passes the enabling act presented here in this Legislature, would receive a credit of sixty-four thousand dollars; the other sixteen thousand dollars would go into the national treasury. Comparatively speaking, sixteen thousand dollars is a small amount of money, but when we come to add to this the tax that will be collected from estates of less than one million dollars and those that will be collected from estates of more than one million dollars, it amounts to a considerable sum. In fact, during the nine years from 1916 to 1925, there was collected from the State of Maine nearly nine millions of

dollars under this Federal Estate Inheritance Tax Law. It would doubtless be true that under the present rate this amount would not be so large, but, nevertheless, why should the Federal Government take from the State, at a time when its treasury has the largest surplus ever known in the history of the world, take this money from the State, when we ourselves need it for the reduction of our own taxes?

There is probably only one reason—that is, for the sake of compelling the State of Florida to impose inheritance taxes. Then the question arises, why should forty-five states of the Union be compelled to accept a Federal levy for the sake of punishing one or possibly two or three of our sister states? There are only three states in the Union that have no Inheritance Tax Law. It seems to me that if we must have a tax rate so high as to absorb this credit given us under the Federal law, that every cent of it should go for our own benefit, and not to be taken out of the State to be used for purposes in some other states in the Union—in fact, we should keep in mind that not a cent goes into the National Treasury to be returned to the State except that which is first taken from the states and goes into the National Treasury.

Now it seems to me that this is not the place to discuss the Inheritance Tax Law, but there are some who feel that possibly what is good for Florida may be good for the State of Maine, and there are some also who feel that there should be greater returns to the State in some way for the benefit of our charitable institutions.

Then again, we are faced with a serious problem, and one of the greatest of those problems that confront us today is the centralization of power in the Federal Government. President Coolidge has repeatedly warned us against this danger. As an illustration of the extent to which this matter has gone, let us go back to 1887 and we find in the employ of the Federal Government only one hundred and ninety-six agents, deputies and inspectors definitely employed. Ten years later in 1897, we find this number has increased to three thousand, and today we have in the employ of the United States Government more than forty thousand agents and inspectors.

Going back to 1913 and you have a national budget of something like six hundred and thirty-seven millions of dollars. Today we have a national budget of over three and one-half billions of dollars. It seems to me, gentlemen, that the time has come when we should return to the taxing system of our forefathers, get back where each and every one of us feels an individual responsibility in our Government and go back so far as possible to the old fashioned town meeting.

Now this or a similar resolution has been introduced in thirty-five of the forty states where the legislatures are holding sessions this winter. Up to the present time fourteen states have already adopted the resolution, including the state of Vermont, by a unanimous vote in both the House and the Senate. The matter will be taken up in a few days by the State of Massachusetts and also by the State of Connecticut. In Massachusetts the resolution is being favored and strongly endorsed by Governor Fuller, as also in the State of Connecticut by Governor Trumbull.

It seems to me that after fourteen states have considered this matter that it must at least have some merit, and I trust that the members of this House will give this matter their favorable consideration, and by so doing not vote to punish a sister state, but to conserve to ourselves this great source of revenue, to be used as we see fit for the benefit of the citizens of our own commonwealth.

Mr. ALDRICH of Topsham: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question as to how this will operate? As I understand what the gentleman said, under the Inheritance Tax Law, if there be a tax on an estate of, let us say, one hundred thousand dollars, which is payable to the United States Government, and if, under the Inheritance Tax Law of the State of Maine the taxes payable to the State of Maine were eighty thousand dollars, the executor of that estate instead of paying to the Federal Government the sum of one hundred thousand dollars, would pay to the Federal Government the sum of twenty thousand dollars, being allowed a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to abolish the Federal estate (inheritance) tax. (H. D. No. 11)

credit for eighty thousand dollars, which is paid to the State of Maine in inheritance tax.

Now I should like to ask the gentleman whether the proposal behind this resolution is that in place of paying the twenty per cent or the twenty thousand dollars to the Federal Government, it is proposed, if Congress can be induced—

(At this point the President of the Senate was escorted by the Messenger to a seat beside the Speaker amid the applause of the House, the members rising.)

Mr. ALDRICH continuing: I would like to inquire whether, if Congress can be induced to repeal the Federal Estate Tax, that then it is proposed that the State of Maine shall increase its inheritance taxes by the sum of the twenty thousand dollars which we no longer would have to pay to the United States Government?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may answer if he desires.

Mr. HOLMAN: Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to answer the gentleman's question, not knowing the attitude of the members of this Legislature. Were the Federal Estate Inheritance Tax Law repealed, of course then the opportunity and responsibility of levying taxes would be left entirely to this Legislature, and until this Federal law is repealed, it would be impossible for us to do anything except to pass the enabling act, as I have said, making it possible to make our inheritance tax rate sufficiently large to absorb the credit that is granted us under this Federal Tax Law.

Of course all estates of one hundred thousand dollars or more, under the present tax, are exempt. I might add for the benefit or for the information of the members that when the matter came up for the repeal of all Federal Estate Tax Laws, fifty-one of our United States Senators voted in favor of repealing all Federal Estate Tax Laws; only thirty-one voted against the repeal. Our own Senator Hale voted in favor of the repeal of all Federal Estate Taxes, and our own Senator Fernald happened to be absent at that time. I understand that one member among our Congressman is in favor of not repealing the present law at this time, but of course it would be impossible to repeal it during the present Congress,

as that Congress is about to adjourn within a few days. The other three Congressman, I understand, were in favor of the repeal.

Mr. HALE of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire the number of the printed document before the House.

The SPEAKER: House Document No. 11.

Mr. HALE: Mr. Speaker, I think that possibly there is some confusion in the minds of members between the two bills, and I think I may be able to possibly throw some light upon the question asked by the gentleman from Topsham, Mr. Aldrich. There are two measures before the House. One is House Document No. 11, which is under discussion, which simply memorializes Congress to abolish the Federal Estate Tax altogether and get clean out of the field. There is another measure now pending, I think, in a committee, House Document 58, which allows the State the right to take advantage of the increased credit given under the Revenue Act of 1926, recently passed by Congress. House Document No. 58 would take money from the Federal Government and put it into our Treasury here. That legislation provides for a re-apportionment, but the document now under consideration, House Document No. 11, is simply a memorial to Congress, asking it to stop levying any Federal Estate Tax at all.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question is upon the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Holman.

Mr. STURGIS of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know who is behind this bill for the repeal of that law. I would ask the gentleman from Bangor.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor (Mr. Holman) may answer if he cares to do so.

Mr. HOLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will say that there are fourteen states behind it already, if that answers the question.

Mr. STURGIS: Mr. Speaker, that does not answer the question. I want to know who is behind it, who is sponsoring the bill.

The SPEAKER: Has the gentleman from Bangor (Mr. Holman) yielded the floor?

Mr. HOLMAN: To answer the

question directly, Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman like to know the committees behind it? The committee that is working for the repeal of the Federal Estate Inheritance Tax is made up of a practically nation-wide committee. There are some two-thirds of the states of the Union represented on that committee. It so happens that the state of New York has no representation and that there are no New York members on the committee.

Mr. STURGIS: Mr. Speaker, I understood that the Bankers' Association is behind this and some members on that committee had their fees paid to go to that committee, as I understand it. To my mind the state of Florida has already repealed its inheritance tax, has it not, and it would open the door for Maine to follow suit, and perhaps we would get men of immense means to come here and settle, and by repealing that inheritance tax altogether perhaps it would be a good thing for Maine. I only ask this question for information.

Mr. HOLMAN: Mr. Speaker, may we have a rising vote when the vote is taken?

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is upon the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Holman, that report A, reporting ought to pass on the concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to abolish the Federal Estate Tax. Those in favor of accepting report A, ought to pass, will rise and the monitors will return the count.

A division being had,

One hundred and six voting in the affirmative and five in the negative, report A of the committee on Federal Relations was accepted.

On motion by Mr. Holman of Bangor, the concurrent resolution was adopted.

Paper from the Senate, out of order:

Ordered the House concurring, that the following bills be recalled from the Committee on Ways and Bridges:

An act to amend the distribution of tax on gasoline, H. P. 66 H. D. 24.

An act relating to a tax upon gasoline, H. P. 754, H. D. 211.

An act relating to a tax upon gasoline, H. P. 755, H. D. 212.

An act relating to application of

gasoline taxes collected, H. P. 765, H. D. 213.

In the Senate, read and passed.

In the House, read and passed in concurrence.

First Reading of Printed Bills and Resolves

(H. P. 182) (H. D. 256) An act to incorporate the Great Pond Railway Company.

(H. P. 910) (H. D. 254) An act to amend "An Act to incorporate the Richardson Wharf Company approved April 2, 1856" as amended by an act approved February 13, 1880.

(H. P. 31) (H. D. 255) An Act to set off a part of the town of Penobscot in the county of Hancock and annex the same to the town of Castine.

(H. P. 909) (H. D. 252) Resolve providing a State pension for Joseph A. Trueworthy.

(H. P. 908) (H. D. 253) Resolve for Teachers' pension for Etta M. Patten.

Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: Under orders of the Day the Chair lays before the House under "tabled and today assigned" H. D. 168, an act relative to passes on common carriers for Public Utilities Commission, tabled by Mr. Foster of Ellsworth, February 22, pending assignment for third reading.

On motion by Mr. Foster of Ellsworth, the bill was re-tabled and specially assigned for Wednesday, March 2.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House an act relative to the salary of the mayor of the city of Augusta, H. P. 889, tabled by Mr. Kinsman of Augusta February 23, pending reference to a committee.

On motion by Mr. Kinsman of Augusta, the bill was referred to the committee on Salaries and Fees.

The SPEAKER: The House is now proceeding under orders of the day. Is there any matter which any member would like to take from the table at this time?

On motion by Mr. Littlefield of Kennebunk, it was voted to take from the table S. D. 11, H. P. 47, tabled by that gentleman, February 23, pending first reading under suspension of the rules.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer amendment A.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that under the rules the amendment is not in order until the bill has had its first two readings.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Littlefield, the bill had its first two readings under suspension of the rules.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Speaker: I offer House Amendment A and move its adoption.

House Amendment A to bill an act in relation to advertising signs along public ways.

Amend said bill by adding after the word "hotel," wherever the same occurs, the words "or farm."

The SPEAKER: The question is upon the adoption of House Amendment A.

Mr. PATTERSON of Castine: Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee on judiciary who signed the majority report upon that bill, I wish to speak very briefly in relation to this amendment because I want the members of the House to understand what the amendment will mean. The bill itself is an amendment to Section 1 of Chapter 188 of the Public Laws of 1925. That section prohibited the display of any sign, billboard, panel, placard, poster, notice or other advertising device in, upon or above any public highway or so situated with respect to any public highway as to obstruct clear vision of an intersecting highway or highways, etc.; and the amendment which the committee reported provides that this law shall not apply to signs or panels bearing the name of a camp or hotel and a hand or arrow giving the direction, providing that said sign or panel shall not exceed 24 inches in length and 12 inches in width and shall only be posted at the junction of roads in a town where such camp or hotel is located. In other words, the purpose of the bill is to allow a little sign, 12 inches wide and 24 inches long, without any advertising or display matter upon it, simply with an arrow pointing the way to the camp or the hotel, allowing those signs to be put up at the junction of roads.

There was a considerable discussion of this matter and the committee got a divided report; and I do not believe that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Littlefield, should be adopted.

I suppose the purpose of this amendment is to put farm houses having summer boarders in the same class

with hotels or camps; but the amendment, as I understand it, says "any farm." I think the House can very readily see that if this amendment is adopted you will have signs at every junction of roads in Maine pointing the way to every farm in Maine, and that the whole purpose of Section 1 of Chapter 188 will be nullified. Of course I can only speak for myself, but I hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Littlefield, will not be adopted.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD of Kennebunk: Mr. Speaker, I rather think from my experience that the farmer has as good a right to advertise his farm as a man who puts up a few little houses out here and calls them summer camps. In my own territory we have a man who has spent thousands of dollars in an orchard, not only apples, but pears, peaches and grapes and all kinds of fruits which can be raised. That farm is two miles from the State highway. He has always had a small sign, I should say, eight by twelve. On that sign he has "Clark's Fruit Farm," with an arrow pointing in that direction. Now the gentleman would have you think that the only man who has any right to advertise at the corner of the street is some such place as the Poland Spring House, perhaps, or somebody who has got a lot of little camps just large enough for two people to sleep in over night. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this House will do any such thing, and I trust that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. McKNIGHT of Poland: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word on this amendment and on the subject in general. We have had some experience in our town with these small signs. I do not see any reason, if signs are going to be allowed to be put up over the State, why the farmers—as this gentleman has just mentioned—should not have the same privileges as the hotels. So far as this amendment goes if all these summer camps, hotels and farmers are going to be allowed to stick up these little signs around every four corners, it is going to become a nuisance in time. If they go through our town and put up these little signs of camps twenty, thirty or forty miles distant and stick them up around these various four corners, it will become a nuisance. The State requires that the towns shall put up at corners a guide post at least eight feet up from the ground on a State aid road and on State roads they have a rul-

ing that these signs shall be put up on a square post, six inches square, with a board that has a beveled edge, two inches wide and 24 inches long. They are very particular about these signs. If you allow these camps to nail up these signs through the State, it will detract from the beauty of the original signs, and these signs on these State roads cost five or six dollars apiece. Now if the hotels and camps want to put up signs, I am in favor of the farmer doing so.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is upon the adoption of House Amendment A presented by the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Littlefield. Is the House ready for the question?

A viva voce vote being taken, the amendment was adopted, and the bill as amended had its first two readings, under suspension of the rules, and tomorrow assigned for the third reading.

On motion by Mr. Hale of Portland, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby the bill was assigned for its third reading tomorrow morning; and on further motion by the same gentleman the matter was tabled, pending assignment for third reading.

Mr. PIPER of Jackman: Mr.

Speaker, is H. P. 276 in the hands of the Clerk?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will advise the gentleman that it is.

On motion by Mr. Piper of Jackman, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby House Paper 276, resolve in favor of Forks Plantation, Somerset County, for the purpose of building a bunter in the river that protects the covered bridge over the Kennebec river was referred to the committee on Interior Waters; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill was referred to the committee on Ways and Bridges.

On motion by Mr. Piper of Jackman, it was voted to take from the table Senate Paper 354, an act to incorporate Somerset Woods Trust, tabled by that gentleman, February 23, pending reference to the committee on Judiciary in non-concurrence; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill was referred to the committee on Judiciary in concurrence with the Senate.

On motion by Mr. King of Orono, Adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.